UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.            | FILING DATE                   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/849,510                 | 05/19/2004                    | Gregory John Billington | 07703-340RE1        | 6776             |
| 26211<br>FISH & RICHA      | 7590 02/04/200<br>ARDSON P.C. | EXAMINER                |                     |                  |
| P.O. BOX 1022              | 2                             | BEAUCHAINE, MARK J      |                     |                  |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022 |                               |                         | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                            |                               |                         | 3653                |                  |
|                            |                               |                         |                     |                  |
|                            |                               |                         | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                            |                               |                         | 02/04/2008          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/849,510   | BILLINGTON ET AL.  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  | MARK J. BEAUCHAINE   | 3653   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence address  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).   | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 2.   | action is non-final.<br>nce except for formal matters, pro   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-36 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-36 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers   | vn from consideration.   |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine  | r.   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 19 May 2004 is/are: a) ☐ Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.   | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj  | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).                      |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/546,126.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/18/07.  | 4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:  | te   |  |  |  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The text of claims 30 and 31 is redundant to that of claims 28 and 29, respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8,12-14, 20-23, 33, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent Number 4,611,205 by Eglise ("Eglise") in view of Patent Number 5,464,087 by Bounds ("Bounds"). The money handling device

Art Unit: 3653

disclosed by Eglise includes money handling apparatus/coin dispenser 4 of a first type, internal controller 20 that controls and communicates with said money handling apparatus using a bus-oriented communications protocol not fully supported over first port 24, external controller 26 for communicating with said internal controller via said first port, and further money handling apparatus/card reader 22 of a second type (see Figures 1 and 2). Said first type of money handling apparatus handles money of a type that is different from the type of money that is handled by said second type of money handling apparatus. Said communications protocol supports communication between said internal controller and any one of said first and second types of money handling apparatus.

The money handling devices are arranged such that communications between said external controller and said further device for handling money are relayed by said internal controller. Furthermore, said internal controller is arranged to distinguish between said first and second type of money handling devices by a code received from said further device and to copy signals without modification thereof (see column 7, lines 8-14 and 62-66), and is arranged such that signals are stored in memory 708 prior to output (see Figure 7).

Eglise fails to disclose ports for removable connections. Bounds teaches a money handling device including first port 30 for removable connection to external controller 8 (see Figure 1 and column 5, lines 24-41) and second port 30 for removable connection to a further money handling device (see column 3, lines 57-61; and column 6, lines 26-49) for the purpose of permitting the removal and replacement of device

components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the removable connection ports of Bounds into the device of Eglise for the purpose of permitting the removal and replacement of device components.

Page 4

Claims 2, 10, 11, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eglise in view of Bounds as applied to claims 1, 8, 20 and 22 above, and further in view of Patent Number 5,442,568 by Ostendorf et al ("Ostendorf").

Eglise/bounds fails to disclose a banknote validator. Ostendorf teaches a money handling device including banknote validator 320 (see Figure 1) for the purpose of providing an operator with a means of activating said device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the banknote validator of Osterdorf into the money handling device of Eglise/Bounds for the purpose of providing an operator with a means of activating said device.

Eglise/Bounds fails to disclose the modification of said signals prior to output from said controller. Said device by Ostendorf is arranged such that the content of some of the signals that are received by controller 310 and are characteristic of further money handling device 320 is modified prior to output from said controller (see column 2, lines 52-62) for the purpose of permitting communication between components configured to different protocols. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the signal modification

controller of Ostendorf into the device of Eglise/Bounds for the purpose of permitting communication between components configured to different protocols.

Page 5

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eglise in view of Bounds as applied to claim 4 above, and in further view of Patent Number 6,119,053 by Taylor et al ("Taylor"). Eglise/Bounds fails to disclose an MDB protocol. Taylor teaches a money handling apparatus comprising an MDB protocol (see column 3, lines 16-23) for the purpose of providing a means of communication between apparatus components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the MDB protocol of Taylor into the money handling device of Eglise/Bounds for the purpose of providing a means of communication between device components.

Claims 15-19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eglise in view of Bounds in view of Ostendorf. The money handling device disclosed by Eglise includes money handling apparatus/coin dispenser 4 of a first type, internal controller 20 that controls and communicates with said money handling apparatus using a bus-oriented communications protocol not fully supported over first port 24, external controller 26 for communicating with said internal controller via said first port, and further money handling apparatus/card reader 22 of a second type (see Figures 1 and 2). Said first type of money handling apparatus handles money of a type that is different from the type of money that is handled by said second type of money

handling apparatus. Said communications protocol supports communication between said internal controller and any one of said first and second types of money handling apparatus.

Page 6

The money handling devices are arranged such that communications between said external controller and said further device for handling money are relayed by said internal controller. Furthermore, said internal controller is arranged to distinguish between said first and second type of money handling devices by a code received from said further device and to copy signals without modification thereof (see column 7, lines 8-14 and 62-66), and is arranged such that signals are stored in memory 708 prior to output (see Figure 7).

Eglise fails to disclose ports for removable connections. Bounds teaches a money handling device including first port 30 for removable connection to external controller 8 (see Figure 1 and column 5, lines 24-41) and second port 30 for removable connection to a further money handling device (see column 3, lines 57-61; and column 6, lines 26-49) for the purpose of permitting the removal and replacement of device components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the removable connection ports of Bounds into the device of Eglise for the purpose of permitting the removal and replacement of device components.

Eglise fails to disclose the modification of said signals prior to output from said controller. Said device by Ostendorf is arranged such that the content of some of the signals that are received by controller 310 and are characteristic of further money

handling device 320 is modified/converted prior to output from said controller (see column 2, lines 52-62) for the purpose of permitting communication between components configured to different protocols. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the signal modification controller of Ostendorf into the device of Eglise for the purpose of permitting communication between components configured to different protocols.

Eglise fails to disclose a banknote validator. Ostendorf teaches a money handling device including banknote validator 320 (see Figure 1) for the purpose of providing an operator with a means of activating said device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the banknote validator of Osterdorf into the money handling device of Eglise for the purpose of providing an operator with a means of activating said device.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARK J. BEAUCHAINE whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 3653

(571)272-6934. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM through 5:00PM Mondays through Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick H. Mackey can be reached on (571)272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick H. Mackey/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3653

mjb